

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00532 01 OF 02 121830Z

41

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 ERDE-00 NRC-05

/095 W

----- 108711

O P 121720Z NOV 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1276

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0532

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES
OF NOVEMBER 11, 1975

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE NOVEMBER 11 SESSION OF THE
VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE NETHERLANDS
REP, UK REP AND US REP, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV
AND SMIRNOVSKY, POLISH REP DABROWA AND GDR REP OESER. BY
PREVIOUS ARGREEMENT, THE SUBJECT MATTER WAS FORCE DEFINITIONS
AND EXPERTS FROM THE PARTICIPATING DELEGATIONS WERE PRESENT.

2. WESTERN REPS COMPARED THE WESTERN FORCE DEFINITION
WITH THE EASTERN FORCE DEFINITION AND ASKED EASTERN REPS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00532 01 OF 02 121830Z

A SERIES OF SPECIFIC QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE INTRODUCTORY

SECTION OF A POSSIBLE DEFINITION. EASTERN REPS PRESSED FOR ALLIED ACCEPTANCE OF THE PRINCIPLE THAT SIMILAR FORCES ON BOTH SIDES SHOULD BE ASSIGNED TO THE SAME FORCE CATEGORY, GROUND OR AIR, AND GDR REP OESER PROPOSED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE ON THIS POINT FOR INCLUSION IN THE EASTERN DRAFT. EASTERN REPS DECLINED TO ANSWER SPECIFIC QUESTIONS REPEATED BY WESTERN REPS ON THE INTRODUCTORY SECTION OF A DEFINITION AND INSTEAD,POSED A SERIES OF SPECIFIC QUESTIONS OF THEIR OWN BASED ON THE EASTERN APPROACH TO ALLOCATING FORCES BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES.

3. ON THE BASIS OF AN INFORMAL WORKING COPY OF A WESTERN DEFINITION AS A COUNTERPART TO INFORMAL EASTERN DRAFT OF OCTOBER 14, US REP LED OFF WITH COMPARISON OF METHOD OF ALLOCATING FORCES BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR USED BY WEST AND BY EAST. HE POINTED OUT SIMPLICITY OF UNIFORM METHOD AND THE SHORTCOMINGS OF THE EASTERN ENUMERATIVE APPROACH. POLISH REP CLAIMED WESTERN DEFINITION LACKED A METHOD FOR ALLOCATING FORCES BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR AND ACCUSED WEST OF BLOCKING PROGRESS ON A COMMON DEFINITION BY REFUSING TO AGREE TO THE PRINCIPLE THAT SIMILAR FORCES SHOULD BE ASSIGNED TO THE SAME SERVICE CATEGORY, GROUND OR AIR. UK REP ADDRESSED THE INTRODUCTORY SECTION OF A POSSIBLE DEFINITION AND ASKED A SERIES OF SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON COMPREHENSIVENESS AND EXCLUSIONS.

4. KHLESTOV MADE CASE FOR EAST'S PRINCIPLE OF ASSIGNING LIKE FORCES TO LIKE CATEGORIES AND ARGUED THAT DATA CONSIDERATIONS WERE WHOLLY IRRELEVANT: WHAT WAS INVOLVED WAS AN ISSUE OF EQUITY. HE ARGUED THAT WESTERN UNIFORM APPROACH TO DIVISION OF FORCES BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR WAS DEFECTIVE AS A METHOD AND RESULTED IN INEQUITABLE ASSIGNMENT OF FORCES, GDR REP RETURNED TO EASTERN PRINCIPLE OF ALLOCATING SIMILAR TYPES OF FORCES TO THE SAME ARMED SERVICE AND PROPOSED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE ON THIS POINT FOR INSERTION INTO EARLIER EASTERN DRAFT OF OCTOBER 14.

5. NETHERLANDS REP DREW DISCUSSION BACK TO INTRODUCTORY SECTION OF A DEFINITION AND ASKED FURTHER SPECIFIC QUESTIONS CONCERNING IT. EASTERN REPS EVADED REPLY. INSTEAD, THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00532 01 OF 02 121830Z

GDR REP POSED SERIES OF QUESTIONS BASED ON THAT PORTION OF THE EASTERN DEFINITION TEXT WHICH DIVIDES GROUND FROM AIR FORCES BY LISTING THE FORCES OF EACH TYPE.

6. IT WAS AGREED THAT THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION, TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 18, WILL DEAL WITH GENERAL ISSUES. END SUMMARY.

7. US REP AS HOST WELCOMED PARTICIPANTS. DRAWING ON

TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, HE SAID THAT PARTICIPANTS HAD HAD A USEFUL DISCUSSION OF FORCE DEFINITIONS IN THE OCTOBER 28 SESSION. THAT DISCUSSION HAD FOCUSED LARGELY ON CERTAIN GENERAL POINTS THAT WOULD LOGICALLY BELONG IN THE INTRODUCTORY SECTION OF ANY MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE FORCE DEFINITION. DURING THE COURSE OF THE DISCUSSION, WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES HAD COMPARED IN DETAIL THE WESTERN FORMULATIONS OF THESE GENERAL POINTS WITH THE EAST'S FORMULATIONS. PARTICIPANTS HAD FOUND THAT, BY AND LARGE, THERE WAS AGREEMENT ON THE FOLLOWING POINTS: FIRST, THAT THERE SHOULD BE AN AGREED DEFINITION OF FORCES FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS; SECOND, THAT AN AGREED DEFINITION SHOULD BE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE OVERALL POSITION OF EITHER SIDE; THIRD, THAT AN AGREED DEFINITION SHOULD CLEARLY INDICATE BOTH WHAT WAS INCLUDED AND WHAT WAS EXCLUDED FROM DEFINITION; AND, FINALLY, THAT AN AGREED DEFINITION SHOULD CLEARLY DISTINGUISH BETWEEN GROUND FORCES AND AIR FORCES.

8. US REP SAID IT ALSO HAD EMERGED FROM THE DISCUSSION THAT THE BEST METHOD OF DEALING WITH DIFFICULTIES RAISED REGARDING GROUND-BASED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE, HELICOPTER, AND SSM PERSONNEL WOULD BE TO HANDLE THIS ISSUE IN CONNECTION WITH WORKING OUT AN ACTUAL DEFINITION OF FORCES. THIS ISSUE WAS IN FACT ADDRESSED IN THE FORMULATIONS PRESENTED BY BOTH SIDES, ALTHOUGHT IN DIFFERENT WAYS.

9. US REP CONTINUED THAT SOVIET REP HAD SUGGESTED THAT IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO PARTICIPANTS TO HAVE BEFORE THEM THE COMPLETE LANGUAGE OF EACH SIDE'S SUGGESTED DEFINITION. PARTICIPANTS COULD THEN COMPARE IN DETAIL THE TWO APPROACHES THAT HAD BEEN ADVANCED HERE FOR A DEFINITION OF FORCES IN ORDER TO DETERMINE HOW MUCH COMMON GROUND

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00532 01 OF 02 121830Z

EXISTED FOR WORKING OUT A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE DEFINITION. US REP SAID THAT TO MEET THIS SUGGESTION, HE WOULD GIVE EASTERN REPS THE WEST'S SUGGESTED DEFINITION INFORMALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION. THIS PAPER WAS NOT AN OFFICIAL TEXT. IT WAS PROVIDED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE SESSION. IT INCORPORATED BOTH THE ELEMENTS WESTERN REPS HAD GIVEN THE EAST ON OCTOBER 28 AND THE WEST'S SUGGESTED WAY OF ALLOCATING FORCES BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES.

10. AT THIS POINT US REP DISTRIBUTED FOLLOWING WORKING PAPER:

BEGIN TEXT:

1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS, THERE SHOULD BE

AN AGREED DEFINITION OF FORCES. THIS DEFINITION SHOULD BE
WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE NEGOTIATING POSITIONS OF EITHER
SIDE.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00532 02 OF 02 121845Z

41

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 ERDE-00 NRC-05

/095 W

----- 108832

O P 121720Z NOV 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1277

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0532

FROM US REP MBFR

2. THE PURPOSE OF THIS DEFINITION IS:

-- TO ASSURE THAT ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL
IN THE ARMED FORCES OF NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT IN
THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS ARE COVERED BY THE DEFINITION,
AND THAT ONLY SUCH PERSONNEL ARE COVERED BY THIS
DEFINITION. THE TERM "ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL"
AS USED IN THIS DEFINITION EXCLUDES NAVAL PERSONNEL
AS WELL AS RESERVISTS, CIVILIANS, AND THE PERSONNEL
OF OTHER UNIFORMED ORGANIZATIONS EQUIPPED WITH WEAPONS.

-- TO DISTINGUISH, WITH REGARD TO ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY
PERSONNEL, BETWEEN GROUND FORCES AND AIR FORCES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00532 02 OF 02 121845Z

3. THESE FORCES ARE DISTINGUISHED BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR
FORCES AS FOLLOWS:

-- NATO GROUND FORCES ARE ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY
PERSONNEL IN THE NATO COUNTRIES' ARMED FORCES LOCATED
IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, EXCEPT THOSE WEARING THE
UNIFORM OF NATO AIR FORCES.

-- WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES ARE ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY
PERSONNEL IN THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES' ARMED FORCES
LOCATED IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, EXCEPT THOSE
WEARING THE UNIFORM OF WARSAW PACT AIR FORCES OR OF
THE AVIATION COMPONENTS OF THE NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE
COMMANDS.

4. MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE WAYS WILL HAVE TO BE FOUND TO RE-
SOLVE THE DIFFICULTIES RAISED AS REGARDS ALLOCATION TO
GROUND OR AIR FORCES IN THE THREE FOLLOWING CASES: GROUND-
BASED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE, HELICOPTER, AND SSM PERSONNEL.

END TEXT.

11. EASTERN REPS REQUESTED A PAUSE TO READ THROUGH PAPER
AND FOR CONSULTATION. WHEN SESSION RESUMED, US REP SUGGESTED
THAT PARTICIPANTS TURN TO A COMPARISON OF THIS TEXT WITH
EASTERN TEXT, AN INFORMAL TRANSLATION OF WHICH WESTERN REPS
ALSO HAD GIVEN THE EAST
ON OCTOBER 28. FIRST, US REP WANTED TO SAY THAT, ON
OCTOBER 28, WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES HAD MADE A NUMBER OF
POINTS ON THE MATERIAL COVERED IN PARAGRAPHS 1 AND 2 OF
THE WESTERN DEFINITION TO WHICH THE WEST HAD NOT YET
RECEIVED A RESPONSE. ALLIED REPS WOULD LIKE TO RETURN TO
THESE POINTS LATER IN THE PRESENT SESSION. BUT US REP SAID
HE WOULD LIKE TO START BY DISCUSSING PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE
WESTERN TEXT. THIS PARAGRAPH STATED HOW PERSONNEL WOULD
BE ALLOCATED BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR. THE FIRST PART OF THE
WEST'S PARAGRAPH 3 DEALT WITH NATO GROUND FORCES. IT
DISTINGUISHED BETWEEN NATO GROUND FORCE AND AIR FORCE PER-
SONNEL ACCORDING TO THE UNIFORM THEY WORE. THIS WAS A CLEAR
AND SIMPLE CRITERION.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00532 02 OF 02 121845Z

12. US REP SAID THAT ALL ACTIVE DUTY NATO MILITARY PERSONNEL, WITH THE AGREED EXCEPTION, OF COURSE, OF THE NAVY, WORE EITHER AN ARMY UNIFORM OR AN AIR FORCE UNIFORM. CANADIAN FORCES WERE AN EXCEPTION, IN THAT THEY WERE UNIFIED AND ALL WORE THE SAME UNIFORM. THE WEST HAD COUNTED ALL CANADIAN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED IN THE AREA AS GROUND FORCES EXCEPT THOSE ASSIGNED TO AVIATION. THUS, ALL ACTIVE DUTY NATO MILITARY PERSONNEL WERE COVERED BY THE WESTERN FORMULATION, AND ALL WERE DIVIDED BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES. WESTERN REPS HAD POINTED OUT ON PREVIOUS OCCASIONS THAT THE METHOD ADOPTED IN THE EAST'S FORMULATION -- THE ENUMERATIVE METHOD -- WAS CUMBERSOME, IMPRECISE, AND NOT REALLY COMPREHENSIVE. ALLIED REPS BELIEVED THAT THEIR OWN METHOD WAS MUCH THE MORE SIMPLE METHOD, AND MET THE ACTUAL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEFINITION IN A MORE PRACTICAL WAY.

13. US REP CONTINUED THAT THE SECOND HALF OF PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE WESTERN TEXT CONCERNED WARSAW PACT FORCES. WESTERN REPS HAD DONE THE SAME THING HERE AS WITH NATO FORCES. THE ALLIES DEFINED WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES AS ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL EXCEPT THOSE WEARING AIR FORCE UNIFORMS AND THOSE WEARING THE UNIFORM OF AVIATION COMPONENTS OF THE NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE COMMANDS. AS WESTERN REPS HAD POINTED OUT, THE ALLIES HAD USED THE CRITERION OF UNIFORM AS THE SIMPLEST METHOD OF DISTINGUISHING GROUND FROM AIR FORCES. THIS WAS NOT AN ARBITRARY METHOD. THE UNIFORM CRITERION REFLECTED ORGANIZATIONAL METHODS RELATED TO FUNCTIONS AND GENERALLY APPLIED ON BOTH SIDES. AS THE WEST HAD USED IT, AND AS USED GENERALLY, THE CONCEPT OF UNIFORM INCLUDED BOTH THE ACTUAL UNIFORM AND THE IDENTIFYING INSIGNIA WORN WITH IT. IN THOSE CASES WHERE MILITARY PERSONNEL WERE NOT READILY DISTINGUISHABLE SOLELY BY THE COLOR OF THEIR UNIFORM, THEY COULD BE DISTINGUISHED BY THEIR INSIGNIA.

14. US REP SAID THAT THE WEST'S PARAGRAPH 4 DEALT WITH A GROUP OF PERSONNEL WHOM EASTERN REPS HAD POINTED OUT COMPRISED ONLY A SMALL FRACTION OF THE TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA. PARTICIPANTS HAD HAD SOME DISCUSSION OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THIS PARAGRAPH TWO WEEKS AGO. WESTERN REPS HAD EXPLAINED THEN WHY THE WEST COULD NOT AGREE TO
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00532 02 OF 02 121845Z

A DEFINITIVE ALLOCATION OF THEE DISPUTED TYPES OF FORCES BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR UNTIL PARTICIPANTS COULD CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE IMPLICATIONS OF SUCH AN ALLOCATION IN TERMS OF ITS EFFECTS ON OVERALL FORCE TOTALS THROUGH EXCHANGE OF DATA. GIVEN THE POSITIONS OF BOTH SIDES ON

THE DATA ISSUE, ALLIED REPS THOUGHT THIS FORMULATION IN PARA
4 OF THEIR DEFINITION WAS A REASONABLE ONE. WESTERN REPS HAD
POINTED OUT TO THE EAST THAT, AFTER THERE HAD BEEN
AN EXCHANGE OF DATA, THE WEST MIGHT BE PREPARED TO DISCUSS AS
ONE OF SEVERAL POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS, A SOLUTION THAT, IN THE
CASE OF EACH OF THESE THREE TYPES OF FORCES, WOULD ASSIGN
SIMILAR FORCES TO THE SAME CATEGORY, EITHER GROUND OR AIR FORCES,
ON BOTH SIDES.

REMAINDER OF REPORT SENT VIA AIRGRAM.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, NUCLEAR WEAPONS, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, MEETING PROCEEDINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 12 NOV 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: greeneet
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975MBFRV00532
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750394-0069
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19751150/aaaabsya.tel
Line Count: 341
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <17 SEP 2003 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF NOVEMBER 11, 1975
TAGS: PARM, XH, XT, US, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006